REMARKS

The application was filed with 49 claims. Applicant previously canceled claims 1-7, 10-15, 17-36, 39-40, and 43-49. Applicant cancels claims 8, 9, 16, 37, 38, 41, and 42. Applicant adds new claims 50 and 51. Accordingly, claims 50 and 51 are currently pending. Applicant requests that the pending claims be considered.

Examiner Interview

On December 19, 2005, the Examiner mailed an Interview Summary regarding the telephonic interview of December 14, 2005. As described therein, Dinesh Sheth, Applicant, Doug Schelling, Applicant's attorney, and Examiner discussed the independent claims and cited references (Kumar, Khan, Flesner). Applicant described aspects of the invention which were supported by the application. Examiner described his interpretation of the prior art. Applicant indicated a willingness to file an RCE to proceed forward with prosecution of the application.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner rejects claims 8, 9, 16, 37, 38, 41 and 42 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as allegedly being unpatentable. Applicant has canceled claims 8, 9, 16, 37, 38, 41 and 42, thus making the rejections moot. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejections be reconsidered and withdrawn.

-4-

New Claims

Applicant has added new claims 50 and 51. No new matter has been added by the amendments. Support for the amendments is found in the application as filed. More specifically, support for the new claims is found on pages 15-18, 44, Figures 6A, 6B, 6C, 7A, 7B, 10A, 10B, 11A, 11B, 11C, 12A, and 12B, and original claims 1 and 22, in additional to other locations within the application, as filed.

Applicant has added claims 50 and 51. In addition to the other listed steps within claim 50, that claim includes the steps of processing data retrieval by scripting, accessing data by the script knowledge database (reference no. 532 within the application), and allowing automatic login to the selected web-sites by a user. Applicant's discussion of scripting and the script knowledge database is found on the specific pages and figures listed above. Regarding these specifically mentioned limitations, Applicant believes neither the cited reference of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0194267 by Flesner nor U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0007330 by Kumar include all limitations of pending claim 50, nor all of the limitations of pending claim 51. Regarding claim 50, Applicant draws Examiner's attention to Figures 6A, 6B, 6C, 7A, and 7B of Applicant's application in order to gain a full understanding of the claimed method. Figures 6A, 6B, and 6C show how the layout is built and manipulated. Figures 7A and 7B show how the specific layout is created. Comparison of that disclosure to Figure 17 of Kumar highlights the differences therein. Further, regarding data retrieval, Applicant draws Examiner's attention to Figures 10A, 10B, 11A, 11B, and 11C of the filed application and suggests that it be compared to Figure 5 of Kumar, which shows how a request is handled. For example, in Figure 5 of Kumar, the data is stored and compiled in HTML format. As can be seen in these comparisons, the

-5-

claimed method differs from Kumar. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that claim 50 be considered.

Regarding claim 51, a comparison of Figure 5 of Kumar to Figures 10A, 10B, 11A, 11B, and 11C of the filed application demonstrates that Kumar does not include all limitations of claim 51, which depends from claim 50. More specifically, within Figure 5 of Kumar, a browser control is activated to navigate to specified web-sites (reference no. 103), automatic log-in is performed (105), summary data is parsed (107) and stored (111), and summary data is rendered as HTML (113). Now, referring to Figures 10A, 10B, 11A, 11B and 11C of Applicant's application, Applicant describes getting web-site details (536), decrypting the user name (612) and password (620), establishing a session with the website (632 and 644) based on web-site characteristics, and, for secured web-sites, there is the process of SSL certificate exchange with secure socket connection and exchange of information at the server level. Figure 5 of Kumar does not address these additional elements. Further, regarding Applicant's disclosure, once the connection is established, the script knowledge module has session information and cookies (684) from the server to manage. Accordingly, the script knowledge module (684) handles such cookies and session parameters to navigate to the desired page on the site. Once all required data is collected by the knowledge module, it is encrypted (704) and stored (708) in the database. In summary, claim 51 depends from claim 50 and provides additional limitations regarding the step of retrieving data from the selected web-sites. Applicant respectfully requests that pending claim 51 be considered.

-6-

Applicant has merely commented upon certain aspects of the invention and reserve the

right to provide further comments as necessary. Applicant notes that these remarks should not

create limitations to the claims and that the claim language itself should be considered.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a

telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

Date ___Nov. 14, 2006___   By ___Douglas W. Schelling___

WYATT, TARRANT & COMBS, LLP   Douglas W. Schelling, Ph.D.
Suite 800   Attorney for Applicant
1715 Aaron Brenner Drive   Registration No. 48,335
Memphis, TN 38120-4367
Phone: 901-537-1049
Fax: 901-537-1010

> Should additional fees be necessary in connection with the filing of this paper, or any future
> papers, or if a petition for extension of time is required for timely acceptance of same, the
> Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge Deposit Account No 502346 for any such fees;
> and applicant hereby petitions for any needed extension of time.

-7-